

Box 55045
Omaha 68155

2 January 69

Dear Hal,

Well, it seems--especially from Garrison's point of view--a brand new ball game. I admit I was rather pessimistic: I thought Shaw might pull it off, get himself out of the soup. It is still possible, I suppose, but let's hope the D.A.'s luck holds and he has a chance to at least present his case. As you well know, and have in fact remarked to me in the past, time is of considerable importance--too much time, indeed, may now have passed for the case to ever be really solved.

As I read more about JFK I am struck by the tenacity of the belief that Oswald, and only Oswald, was the assassin. An odd sort of blindness, I think. Manchester seems to go out of his way to try and support this idea. Sorenson and Salinger claim it doesn't really make a damn bit of difference who killed the President...but seem impatient with anyone doubting the veracity of the Warren Report. All of this seems to me very strange. On the specific point of Oswald's involvement, I don't understand how anyone could now seriously argue for the "lone assassin" (Oswald) theory. I noted the other day that even the new World Almanac refers to Oswald as the "alleged assassin." Still, it is significant, I think, that the Supreme Court did not honor Shaw's petition: if it had ruled the Warren Report "the law of the land" (this is what I understood Shaw had asked), everything would be, surely, infinitely more difficult.

News of Edward Kennedy's bid for Long's position in the Senate comes as a bit of a surprise. The papers here say he hasn't a chance...but the Kennedy's don't usually opt for a cause already lost. I wonder what's up.

Oh, yeah: I need my 1962 W2 Form. You can go ahead and xerox it and keep the copy if you think you or Garrison might need it sometime, but I'd appreciate it if you could return the original to me. Incidentally, I'd like a typescript of our interview if you have one.

--Must go,

All good wishes,

